

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/822,617	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WEISS, MARK A.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thomas J. Lett	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Thomas J. Lett. (3) Mark Weiss.  
 (2) Clark A. Jablon. (4) King Poon.

Date of Interview: 05 April 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 3.

Identification of prior art discussed: Seymour (USPN 5,967,050).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 KING Y. POON  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant and Applicant's representative discussed the background of the invention and the difference between the instant application and the prior art of Seymour(5,967,050). Examiner agreed that the claims of said application read over the prior art of Seymour. Examiner will update search based on the claims or any amended claims. The Examiner maintains the 35 USC 101 rejection directed to the current claims since said claims are still considered non-statutory based on MPEP 706.03 regarding printed matter.